

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8-9. Claim 1 has been amended to improve its form and to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 has been canceled. In addition, claims 4 and 7 have been canceled in favor of new claims 8 and 9, respectively. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because claim 1 uses the phrase "like e.g." and because the phrase "higher pressure" was said to be unclear. In addition, claim 4 was considered indefinite because it recited "wherein directly before the second absorption stage (49) a flash stage (55) is arranged", whereas the drawing was said to show the flash stage (55) after the second absorption stage.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove the phrase "like e.g. mineral gas or synthesis gas," and has changed "higher" pressure to pressure -- greater than the increased

pressure -- which it is respectfully submitted overcomes the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

With respect to claim 4, Applicant has canceled claim 4 in favor of new claim 8 which conforms more closely to the drawings. New claim 8 specifies that directly downstream of the second absorption stage a flash stage is arranged in which the absorbing substance coming out from the absorption stage is de-stressed and the released valuable gas, which mainly contains hydrogen sulphide,  $H_2S$  and carbon dioxide,  $CO_2$ , is guided back into the second absorption stage.

It is respectfully submitted that all currently pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection on this basis be withdrawn.


Claims 1 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over *Marjanovich et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,820,837, in view of *Khanmamedov* U.S. Patent No. 6,506,349, as evidenced by *Ameen* U.S. Patent No. 3,594,985. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Marjanovich et al.*, in view of *Khanmamedov*, and further in view of *Palmer* U.S. Patent No. 7,147,691. The Examiner, however, has not made any rejections with respect to claims 3, 4, and 7 on the basis of the prior art.

In response, without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections and in order to expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3 and has canceled claims 4 and 7 in favor of new claims 8 and 9, which substantially incorporate their subject matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended and new claims 8 and 9, together with claims 2 and 5-6 which depend on claim 1 as amended, are now in condition for allowance.

In summary, claim 1 has been amended, claims 3, 4 and 7 have been canceled, and new claims 8 and 9 have been added. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,  
Johannes MENZEL



---

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298  
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048  
Attorneys for Applicant

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802

FJD:cmm

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 26, 2008.



---

Amy Klein